DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 341 UD 011 997

AUTHOR Wetmore, Peter, Ed.
TITLE Alternatives to Delinquency Institutions. Institute Series, Number 1.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Center for Youth Development and Research.
PUB DATE Jun 71
NOTE 27p.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for Youth Development & Research, University of Minnesota, 304 Walter Library, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455 (Price not known)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Anti Social Behavior; Behavior Problems; *Corrective Institutions; *Decentralization; *Delinquency Causes; Delinquency Prevention; *Delinquent Rehabilitation; Delinquents; Emotionally Disturbed; Institutional Personnel; Personnel Selection; *Rehabilitation Programs; Self Concept; Self Esteem

ABSTRACT

The Center for Youth Development and Research called a conference on April 13, 1970 at the University of Minnesota to discuss the present treatment of juvenile offenders and future approaches to working with delinquents. The participants represented diverse backgrounds and included corrections personnel, juvenile court judges, former offenders, and faculty and students from several disciplines. As the basis for the discussions, a paper on delinquency institutions by Gisela Konopka was read by all conference participants. The focus of this paper was on the need to phase out mass institutions and to replace them with a range of community based facilities, including group homes and small youth communities. She stressed that any program for delinquent youth must be geared toward the enhancement of their self-respect. This means that only people who have a positive attitude of respect toward youth should be employed in such facilities, and that all staff members, regardless of their position or educational background, should receive training. She also suggested that community volunteers, and especially young people, should work with young delinquents in these group homes or youth communities. Finally the paper urged that stringent evaluation should accompany the implementation of any new system of treating youthful offenders. The discussion of the one-day conference was tape recorded and the dialogue was edited and reconstructed from the transcripts. (Editor/JM)

ED 058341

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ALTERNATIVES TO DELINQUENCY INSTITUTIONS

Center for Youth Development and Research
University of Minnesota
Institute Series No. 1 June 1971

Additional copies are available from the Center for Youth Development and Research, University of Minnesota, 304 Walter Library, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

UD 011997

1

The Center for Youth Development and Research at the University of Minnesota provides an interdisciplinary focus in research, teaching and work with youth.

Staff:
Dr. Gisela Konopka, Director
Mrs. Diane Hedin, Assistant to the Director
Mrs. Miriam Seltzer, Program Facilitator
Mr. V. Joseph McAuliffe, Common Learnings Project
Miss Susan Sticha, Secretary

Advisory Committee to the Center:
Dr. Roland Abraham, Director, Agricultural Extension Service, University of Minnesota
Mrs. Nancy Belbas, Junior League of Minneapolis
Mr. Virgil Burns, Director, Minnesota Montessori Foundation
Dr. Paul Cashman, Vice President for Student Affairs, University of Minnesota
Dr. Warren Cheston, Dean, Institute of Technology, University of Minnesota
Dr. John Darley, Psychology Department, University of Minnesota
Mr. Eugene Eidenberg, Special Consultant to Vice President for Academic Administration, University of Minnesota
Mr. Jewel Goddard, Director, Department of Court Services, Hennepin County
Mr. Larry Harris, Director of Urban Affairs, Minneapolis Public Schools
Mr. William Hoffman, Director, Continuing Education for Social Work, University of Minnesota
Dr. Arthur Johnson, Sociology Department, University of Minnesota
Mrs. Josie Johnson, Regent, University of Minnesota
Mr. Robert Johnson, Anoka County Attorney
Dr. Roland Larson, Associate Director, Youth Research Center
Dr. Harold Stevenson, Director, Institute of Child Development, University of Minnesota
Dr. Frank Wilderson, Assistant Dean, College of Education, University of Minnesota
Mr. Theatrice Williams, Director, Phyllis Wheatley Community Center

INTRODUCTION

Juvenile delinquency is the most pressing crime problem in the United States. Yet, traditional modes of treating the young person who has come into conflict with the law, and especially those who are sent to institutions, are in general totally inadequate. If we make dignity of each person the central core of any work with people, then it is clear that delinquency institutions too frequently violate this concept. The Center for Youth Development and Research called a conference on April 13, 1970, at the University of Minnesota to discuss the present treatment of juvenile offenders and future approaches to working with delinquents. The participants represented diverse backgrounds and included corrections personnel, juvenile court judges, former offenders, and faculty and students from several disciplines.

As the basis for the discussions, a paper on delinquency institutions by Gisela Konopka was read by all conference participants. The focus of this paper was on the need to phase out mass institutions and to replace them with a range of community based facilities, including group homes and small youth communities. She stressed that any program for delinquent youth must be geared toward the enhancement of their self-respect. This means that only people who have a positive attitude of respect toward youth should be employed in such facilities, and that all staff members, regardless of their position or educational background, should receive training. She also suggested that community volunteers, and especially young people, should work with young delinquents in these group homes or youth communities. Finally, the paper urged that stringent evaluation should accompany the implementation of any new system of treating youthful offenders. A copy of Dr. Konopka's paper is available from the Center for Youth Development and Research, 304 Walter Library, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.

The discussion of the one-day conference was tape recorded and the following dialogue was edited and reconstructed from the transcripts by Peter Wetmore.

It is hoped that the thoughts expressed in this conference will stimulate constructive discussion and action.

Gisela Konopka, Director
Center for Youth Development and Research
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

PARTICIPANTS

BARTON ANSON
Director
Ramsey County Court Services
St. Paul

JUDGE LINDSAY ARTHUR
Hennepin County Juvenile Court
Minneapolis

NANCY BELBAS
Former Director
Glen Lake County Home School Volunteer Program, Junior League
Glen Lake

MITCHELL BERDIE
Student—*Psychology Department*
University of Minnesota

VERYL CASHMAN, M.S.W., A.C.S.W.
St. Paul

LINDA COHEN
Former Director
Glen Lake County Home School Volunteer Program, Junior League
Glen Lake

ALICE DILLON
Social Worker
Minneapolis Headstart Program
Minneapolis

ARTHUR DILLWORTH
Assistant Program and Parole Officer
Department of Corrections
State of Minnesota

JOHN ELLINGSTON
Professor Emeritus
Law School
University of Minnesota

JUDGE ARCHIE GINGOLD
Ramsey County Juvenile Court
St. Paul

JEWEL GODDARD
Director
Hennepin County Court Services
Minneapolis

DIANE HEDIN
Assistant to the Director
Center for Youth Development and Research
University of Minnesota

ROBERT JOHNSON
County Attorney
Anoka, Minnesota

PAUL KEVE
Formerly Commissioner of Corrections
State of Minnesota
Currently with the Department of Public Communications and Safety
Research Analysis Corporation
McLean, Virginia

JACK KIRKLAND
Associate Director of Black Studies
Associate Professor of Social Work/Black Studies
Washington University
St. Louis

GISELA KONOPKA
Director
Center for Youth Development And Research
University of Minnesota

CAROL LACEY
Staff Writer, Family Life Department
St. Paul Pioneer Press
St. Paul

KENNETH SCHOEN
Director
P.O.R.T.
Rochester

MIRIAM SELTZER
Program Facilitator
Center for Youth Development and Research
University of Minnesota

TAI SHIGAKI
Director of Training
Department of Corrections
State of Minnesota

LYNN THORKILDSON
Assistant Professor
Delinquency Control Institute
University of Minnesota

CHARLES VAN DUSEN
Correctional Officer
Lino Lakes Reception and Diagnostic Center
Circle Pines

BILL WILSON
Instructor-Project Director
Center for Urban & Regional Affairs
University of Minnesota

Why aren't our existing ways of dealing with juvenile delinquency effective?

Konopka: We're here today to seek alternatives to current programs of juvenile rehabilitation. In particular, we want to examine the kinds of facilities now utilized in rehabilitation, and see whether new types of facilities might be designed to serve better in such programs. We have invited the people whom we think are most concerned and most interested in working on change in rehabilitation. Most of them are directly involved in youth treatment, or have themselves experienced life in delinquency facilities. I think today we want to reach some accord on what youth facilities should treat, and how they should best be designed to carry out that task.

Schoen: I hope we can all come to the realization, as I have, that our existing way of dealing with juvenile deliquency—by the mass institution—simply does not come off.

Kirkland: I certainly would agree that institutions cannot effectively treat disturbed youths. And I can see why. Our youth feel fantastic alienation because there are many things that are vital to their own lives with which they are not permitted to deal. They are without power. I think it is important that we show parents, youth counsellors and people in general how to help an individual to gain power, to exercise power and responsibility constructively. I think also we must recognize that many youths today have no opportunity for closeness. They are just at sea, they are adrift, and one of the things that leads to this is an unfulfilled need to be loved, and to give love. Many individuals have never learned how to do this, and you can't teach it in a mass institution.

Goddard: There is a way for people to be allowed the opportunity to grow and blossom into interdependent human beings. But as I see it, there is a great tension in our country about whether we will allow people this kind of freedom, or whether we are going to require that they knuckle under to a particular way of doing things, to an autocratic dependency upon one another. Too often, I see frightening public statements that would press many people into a very dependent status, which would require them to knuckle under to an authority that would

dictate how they should live, how they would cut their hair, whether they would wear a beard, or what kind of clothes they would wear. This runs through our religious, political and educational institutions and perhaps worst, in our institutions for delinquents.

Kirkland: As I see it, this forced obedience is one factor that leads to the alienation of youth that I was talking about. I think there are several kinds of highly visible alienation which we should approach differently than we have in the past. One form of highly visible alienation is to run away. In so doing, an individual is expressing intolerable distress in his situation. But is he running away? Why can't we look at his condition in terms of what is he running to? He must be running to something, and we can deal with that. And we should. A second type of visible alienation is to react violently to the social structure, youths who take up law breaking because they have no other escape valve. Now we look at these people only as deviants. We do not ask, what have we done to you? We don't attempt to understand their problems. A third kind of visible alienation is to drop out, and here our perceptions are really at fault. When we talk about dropping out, we're saying there's something wrong with the person. But what we should do is deal with the idea that we are squeezing people out. We have to examine ourselves.

Dillon: I've been through the institution and probation, and I want to say something about running to something rather than away from something. I can remember being in Sauk Centre, and they said, "well, Alice, you're such a nice girl, and you come from such a nice family. What is your problem at home—what are you running away from home for?" I love my family. If they weren't my mother and father and brothers, they would probably be friends of mine. I've never considered myself running away from home and my family. I guess I was running to something; to what I don't know. Maybe I'm still looking for it. But I think you have to keep this in mind: even though there are a lot of problems with families, I would say most children still want to be with their families. And I think there has to be a way to make it possible for children to stay with the family, or return to the family and stay within some kind of boundaries, so that they won't end up in our institutions.

Berdie: I'd like to speak to this violent reaction Jack mentioned. I've talked to some of the kids who have run away from some of our institutions. And they point out a disturbing phenomenon about our institutions. Many of them feel the community is using them, and that to get what they want in the community, they are compelled to break laws. As we mentioned, they feel powerless and they seek power outside the law. So they get committed. But then they find that the institution perpetuates this lawlessness that they've learned. They find that everybody is still out to take away their rights, still out to use them. A lawyer is appointed to handle a youth's case, but he doesn't talk to his client for the two months between his hearing and trial, and what is that youth supposed to think about the system? He's learning that he doesn't have the control that other people do and in order to get around that, you have to do it in an illegal manner. The point is, our correctional institutions are just an extension of lawlessness youths feel in the community.

Ellingston: The problem of community pressure is large. It seems to me that you're also saying that most prisoners are political prisoners. A young person is put in a family in a ghetto, is deprived of education, jobs and other opportunities, and he reacts by stealing a car or a bottle of whiskey. Then he is shoved into an institution, becomes stigmatized for life and moves from one institution to another. These are political prisoners.

Lacey: We've been talking a lot about participation of youth in their futures, and the process of learning how to cope with life in the community. I don't think a child has to be incarcerated to sense he is a political prisoner. A lot of the young people I know, who aren't juvenile delinquents by any possible stretch of the imagination, feel very repressed by most of the institutions that they come across. Even seventh grade youngsters who are supposed to be going through a rather liberal high school find themselves very repressed and very rebellious. And if they feel that way, then how do you get juvenile delinquents, who are faced with an institutional setting, to feel that their participation will be at all meaningful, or even possible?

Ellingston: One factor behind what you are saying is that most of us as adults don't want independent chil-

dren. We don't, as teachers, as parents, as policemen. We want them to do what we want them to do. And this approach to dealing with youths is certainly apparent in the way we treat delinquents. At present, public opinion about treatment is overwhelmingly in favor of repressive conformity—law and order, to hell with the individual.

Kirkland: It's very obvious we're in the day of law and order. Here we are, talking about understanding youths, and the larger society would respond to this by saying we are talking about coddling. It would say we should really be talking about building bigger and better institutions. The city I'm from—St. Louis—has perhaps 400 hard core delinquents on the street, and it just passed a bond issue to build another detention home to pull them off the streets and move them into other kinds of corrective institutions as the need occurs.

Van Dusen: I think you're quite right about this underlying belief in strong measures towards offenders. I've had occasion to speak to groups, from fifth graders to college students, and I think there are some very strong feelings about corrections, especially juvenile corrections. I've sensed, especially in the last year and a half, a strong leaning towards harsher punishment of juvenile offenders.

Anson: I think here we are talking of a phenomenon that is present in any society, and that is the need for society to punish and to retaliate. And if we are able to develop the kind of corrections program I envision, and send kids back into the community from it, they will still be tainted and society will say, "well, this is not enough. These kids were not punished." This belief permits society to create and to perpetuate the repressive agencies we do have. Before we can begin to improve or replace them, we must soften this need to retaliate.

Kirkland: What you're saying is that there is a pervasive attitude in our society that we should get a pound of flesh.

Gingold: I don't know whether this attitude is as prevalent today as it was ten years ago. I got more flack ten years ago from audiences I addressed in which they demanded that we 'get tough' and 'bear down' on of-

fenders. Today I find a more serious problem: getting people interested enough in corrections to do something about reforming them.

Keve: I found that the public reacts to the matter of the moment. The public will get mad about a boy who steals a car and threatens their lives. They want him hung, or surrounded by dogs, or put in special clothing so they can spot him. But if this same boy gets hung up by his heels in an institution, my mail runs the opposite way. Then we're barbaric, and they want to know when in the world is this mistreatment of boys going to stop? Right now there is a strong punitive reaction toward one man who killed a girl. But I have other people in Stillwater who have done things just as bad, and if I put any one of them in a cell and shoot tear gas at him and deprive him of clothing for six days, then all the public cries, "lean the other way, you're mistreating, you're brutalizing." The public reacts to individual cases, yes. But I've found, too, that if you present in sensible terms an improved correctional program, you'll get pretty good public support.

Goddard: One thing about the correctional system today that I find particularly disturbing is the emphasis upon control and repression. Although it's obvious that it generates more rebellion, an awful lot of energy in the correctional system is directed toward control and repression.

Ellingston: Moreover, we haven't been able to learn from the history of correctional institutions that they do not work. In the 19th century, we began turning to mass institutions for the old, for orphanages, for the mentally ill, and for prisoners and delinquents. And mass institutions have gotten larger, have been a total flop in terms of harm to inmates and terribly increasing costs. The existing institutions are no more successful than the great mass institutions were in the 19th century. And they are not, as we have suggested, even potentially capable of being successful.

Keve: There is a criminogenic aspect to the mass institution that can be seen in many current correctional systems. For example, in Minnesota, the facility at Red Wing is a clear example of how new offenses can easily oc-

Do our present institutions contribute to further delinquency?

cur. Red Wing's facility offers too many opportunities for inmates who run away a chance to compound their problems. The facility is outside of the town. A boy runs away from it, and heads for the Twin Cities, which is only an hour's drive. He has to go through Red Wing, where there are a lot of automobiles sitting around, some with keys in them. So by picking up a car in Red Wing, he has just enough time to get to the Cities before the police can get the dragnet out on him and perhaps even before the car is missed. We've built in a situation where new offenses are going to be created. Nobody thought about it in 1890 when the institution was established. Back then, a runaway could steal a horse and turn it loose to find its way home and there was no danger to anyone. Today, he could steal a car and in his haste to escape, get in an accident and maybe kill someone. The point is, this is an example of how corrections have gotten dug in. We have the institution and we're stuck with it for a long time to come. Here is one prime argument for getting rid of the mass institution: so often they are the cause of trouble, instead of the cure.

Schoen: One reason that I especially object to mass institutions is that so few of the inmates in them belong there. I think we are so locked in with this notion that we must institutionalize that we overlook the fact that some youths don't belong there. They belong in a community setting, not an isolated one. I'll go so far as to say that we can treat 99 per cent of all offenders in the context of the community—working, living, learning, and relaxing in a world without fences.

How many youths would benefit from alternatives to institutions?

Ellingston: Let me offer some figures to back up this contention. When I first went out to California in 1965, I made a study of the offenses for which people were committed. Fully 53 per cent of all referrals to probation departments were kids who were runaways, kids who committed offenses that would not be crimes if committed by adults.

Schoen: I would estimate that 70 per cent of the young people in our state facilities could be treated in community programs, or at least in less regimented environments.

Van Dusen: Even now, in some facilities, there are programs which begin to bridge the gap between mass institutions and the community. I'm involved with a program at Lino Lakes that offers youths a chance to control themselves. I have a cottage with eight kids in my group, which we share with another group of nine. We put the responsibility on the kids; we tell them they have potential and worth as human beings, that they can be helping persons and they they have responsibilities toward their fellow group members. And the kids don't run from this situation, probably because for the first time in their lives they have the opportunity to be helping persons to gain self-recognition and self-worth. We only have runaways if the staff fails to reinforce the group process. The point is, here is an example of how a correctional facility can avoid producing more problems.

Schoen: I think the reason your program is successful is that it avoids a polarization between the staff and the inmates. When you have an inmate who is participating with you in his destiny, then there is mutual cooperation and trust. If you tell him, "this is your life we are talking about, this is what we are going to do and you will have to take some responsibility for this future of yours," then you get away from polarization. Most mass institutions today have a controlling atmosphere that perpetuates polarization. And when things don't go right, we add social workers, we add psychiatrists and psychologists and we say, now things will change. But they don't because the staff and inmates are still polarized.

Dillworth: You raise a valid criticism of current treatment programs, and that is they can get to be too professional in the sense of losing feeling for people. You can become too "professional" in working with kids. You can't play games with them. I've had it happen to me. I've had parole agents put me at the bottom of the barrel and say, "you are going to do this, you accept my value system or I'm going to do this." My reaction has always been, "let me see how far I can go with you." You can't pressure young people this way. I'm working with hard core delinquents at Lino Lakes. These are youths who haven't responded to all the other types of treatment. I've found that one of the biggest things these youngsters need is someone to understand them. They

want someone who will say, "O.K., you've got a big hangup, so tough, let's work on it." Not, "*YOU* work on it, let *US* work on it." You have to recognize this young person as being a human being and possessing feelings just like everyone else.

Kirkland: You also have to recognize that this youth has his own life style. You can't take an individual from a rural background and urbanize him. You can't take an individual from an urban background and cause him to develop an orientation to rural living. But you can expose both of them to each other's styles, and help them to develop what I would call social dexterity. They then have the ability to move through a number of life experiences without losing their own identities. We can see that the institution should not be a place where an individual comes to be a sponge, to soak up so-called social values and go back out and exercise them. He should be able to come in and demand that his right to be unique be recognized. And the institution should respond to him on that basis.

What new approaches are needed to the institution?

Konopka: What we've been talking about shows that a new approach is needed. Up to now, the philosophy of delinquency facilities has been that they house the really bad people. As that California study shows, this isn't true. We've said that control is a prevalent philosophy behind mass institutional corrections. I don't consider control the central philosophy around which I want to build places for delinquents. And I'm talking about delinquents with serious problems. Increasingly, I am concerned with the way we infantalize and protect our children. We don't let them learn that there are a lot of counter forces in the world. A child should grow up knowing that his parents and siblings will support him as a very important human being, and that whenever he hits against a counter force, he can return to his family to get reassurance. I think this is how a facility should treat a youth; it should offer strength and reassurance. I think that is a totally different philosophy than that of, "well, we're here to treat all the really bad people."

Keve: This approach has been tried, and worked well in New York. It's a beautiful setup. The New York State Division for Youth bought two large apartments in an apartment building in an ordinary apartment district.

The apartments were connected by adding a door, and a couple was hired to live there and have what I call an artificial home. It's in every sense a home, and there's less pressure in this than in the kids' own homes because they are away from the forces that induce them to run away. And the kids are in their own neighborhood, they go to their old school, and they're free to come and go as they choose. But the important thing is that if they have internal pressures, there are people who will understand them and give them a chance to blow off.

Gingold: One of the real advantages I see in this type of facility is that it keeps the youngster in the community. He doesn't go through the difficult readjustment in the community after treatment; he's a part of the community while he's being treated.

Konopka: We've just raised a basic question in designing any facility, and that is, how do we develop, in our society where the family is the basic unit of living, treatment systems for youths who are not within their families? I'm talking about youngsters who, for some reason or another, do not want or cannot stay with their families. They need the security families can offer, but they also need to exercise control over their own actions. What I envision is a youth community, where the decisions are made by the members, and where they can seek advice from adults who do not govern each and every thing they do. It's just like home, except that they have been released from many of the pressures which led them to leave home, and they have somebody there who can work with them more intensely than could be done in their own homes with their own families. That's the basic design. I see different kinds of youth communities. One would be located in the same neighborhood that the members grew up in, and where they would attend the same school and churches as they always did. Another would be located in a similar neighborhood setting, but its members would be from another neighborhood living there to experience something different. In all of the youth communities, the emphasis is on governance and direction determined by the members. It's a facility that belongs to its residents.

Is early intervention possible?

Keve: You talk here about substitutions for institutions —small units, residential units—which I think some day we can realize. Today, however, no matter what we like to think, we must contend with an awfully hard core group of people for whom we don't have a good answer except some kind of institutional control. But if we could direct ourselves now to examining the things we ought to be doing, we would have fewer of them. What I am talking about is early intervention. I can recall talking with my children when they were very young, and hearing from them stories about one little boy in the neighborhood. And I said to myself, "that kid is going to be in our juvenile court when he reaches the age to be sufficiently irritating." And sure enough, he did, right on schedule. Is it not a tragic thing that I can sit at home and on the basis of casual information, predict with certainty that five years from now a certain youngster is going to be in our court? I knew it, and I was right. I don't know quite how to do it, but I think we should give someone—the court, perhaps—the means for intervening earlier. Then I would not be under so much pressure as I am now to build an institution, or to put locks and bars around a bunch of kids that we can't seem to deal with in any other way.

Konopka: You bring up a serious problem that I'm not sure we can deal with here. Let's say somebody says this 10 year-old is a potential offender. Where would he go? I think we stand a good chance of making him a worse delinquent if we attempt to detect him early. We would be labelling a young person at age 9 or 10; we would be telling him, "YOU are the potential delinquent." I am worried about what we would be doing to this child.

Seltzer: I don't want to use the word intervention, but at what point could some kind of facility in the neighborhood be utilized to treat youngsters of this sort? Let's say we have a youngster 14 years old. I don't want to go into all the details about what he is doing, or not doing, but someone has identified him with some kind of deviation. At what point do we bring into play other kinds of facilities and services, ones that we all agree just aren't there?

Ellingston: May I answer the question this way: I spent the last six months in San Francisco representing the San Francisco Delinquency Prevention Commission, planning and getting Chinese support for a youth center in Chinatown. The center is open now in the building formerly occupied by a night club that went broke and we got it for $600 a month, more than 5,000 square feet in the heart of Chinatown. Right now, our target group is comprised of Chinese youngsters who have been adjudged delinquent; they are on parole or probation from institutions. What we hope to do eventually is to persuade the police department to bring him to the center, instead of taking the typical minor offender to the detention home. That's still in the future, but the captain of the juvenile bureau is a member of the center's board of directors. So, there's a good chance we'll be able to do that eventually. Anyway, we provide such services as counselling, of course, as well as a place to fall in and bring problems to, emergency beds for kids who are squeezed out of their overcrowded homes or in trouble in one way or another, job training preparation, and job finding. Through the center we hope to help the youngster who is a delinquent, who is in trouble but who hasn't been taken to court. We want to try to keep him out of court, to keep him from resorting to begging, or borrowing, or stealing to stay alive. There are probably 400 of these young people, and we know there is a lot of thieving in Chinatown, and these are the kids we're focusing on. I think this is a start in the right direction toward early intervention, or prevention of delinquency. Does this answer in part the question you were asking?

Seltzer: Well, I guess the question I'm raising is whether I am wrong to think that today we should deal with both prevention and rehabilitation.

Cohn: I think there are many problems that we should be concerned with, including early intervention. But it seems to me that we have to tackle something concrete and something small enough to manage if we really want to make any impact and any real progress. Let's assume, for the purposes of this discussion, that we have young people in court who have to be out of their homes and must be sent somewhere. What do we do with them? We've all agreed we don't like the mass institutions.

Thorkildson: The image I get from the discussion of what we want is a network of neighborhood facilities that are highly adaptable to all types of youth problems. As we just mentioned, one of the first problems that could be handled by these facilities is that of a boy who is apprehended downtown by the police. Instead of taking him to a detention center six or seven miles from home, the arresting officers would return him to the neighborhood facility. There is such a center in operation right now in Denver. It is called an "attention home," and it's more or less a family home. I don't know how this "attention home" is working out, but the concept of returning a youth to a home type of atmosphere, in his neighborhood, is sound. There he is able to utilize the neighborhood institutions that he's been acquainted with all his life—the school he has always gone to, the church, the stores. It dilutes the identity that "I'm a delinquent, I'm a bad person, I HAVE to be here."

Berdie: It's interesting to note that there is a place in Minneapolis that is a haven for runaways. John Herb, who runs the place, tried to provide an atmosphere where youngsters can get themselves together, to work out their problems with the staff and try to return home. There's no reason that such a service couldn't be integrated with the neighborhood facilities we've been talking about. And that way there wouldn't be the dichotomy between "this is a place you go when you're in trouble with the law, and this is a place you can go when you're not in trouble with the law."

Konopka: These are the types of neighborhood facilities that I think we're proposing. But this "attention home" relies upon a close family relationship for success. I see in our youth population, whether delinquent or not, a drive toward early independence. They are reaching adolescence earlier now, but because of the economic situation, they cannot be self-reliant. They want a certain form of independence which some of them find outside the law, and outside their families. Consequently, they don't want to be pushed into a foster family. They don't want another papa and mama. It doesn't fit their style. They want to get into a community where they themselves make their own decisions, where they have adults to turn to but not adults who tell them all the time what to do.

Keve: Let me give an illustration of the sort of thing you're talking about. In Texas there is a private camp for delinquent or pre-delinquent boys which I think is superb. All the boys have had very stressful conditions in their homes and schools, and are removed to this camp to ease the stress. The camp is out in a wilderness area, and the boys had to design their own quarters, decide their cooking arrangements, and just take care of anything that had to do with their living. They take many trips, and they have to plan all of them within a budget and have all the details worked out before they go. They work out everything. The magnificent thing is that they learn how to make decisions in relation to planning things that lead them into the larger community.

Ellingston: California has taken several steps to replace large isolated institutions with treatment in the communities. In the early 1960's, it began to experiment with community treatment programs in Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties. It found that up to seventy percent of juvenile commitments to the Youth Authority could be handled in the open community more successfully than in institutions and at less cost. The thirty percent excluded were the dangerously aggressive and drug addicts.

In 1965 the CYA launched the so-called Reimbursement Program under which the State pays $4,000 to the county for each offender, juvenile and adult, not committed to the State. The $4,000 must be spent to improve probation services. As a result first admissions to the Youth Authority dropped from a peak of 6,190 in 1965 to 3-746 in 1970 (to 4,494 in 1969).

Currently the Youth Authority is urging the establishment of small treatment facilities for youthful offenders (18 to 21) in big cities. They are youth who would normally be committed to institutions. Let me spell out the principles of the program. First, the alternatives to institutions must be located where the problems are right in the middle of high delinquency areas. You don't put your home in the middle class district, you put it right in the eye of the storm such as Watts. Secondly, you involve the community actively in the correction of its own criminal offenders. Third, you reduce the period of incarceration to that needed to start the process of behavioral change. In this time of incarceration, there are

three phases: First is the security phase, which lasts about a month. The members of the home, which number about 16, live inside this place. During that time, from the first day on, they have to make their decisions jointly. The first day, the first decision they have to make is how to organize the kitchen. Their first meal is a TV dinner, and then they're on their own. During the second phase, they begin to venture outside the unit. They sleep there and engage in the group activities they've developed, but they go outside to school, to work and for recreation. They make intensive use of group decision making. The group is made responsible for saying that John Jones can be trusted to go out to this job or to school. Of course, the push is to get the group to decide this early in the period, to help the boys stand on their own as much as possible. In the third phase, they are kind of on parole. They live in the community and return frequently to the home for support and counsel. But the emphases are on helping the individual to become self-reliant and on getting the community to recognize its responsibility in helping the home to succeed.

Johnson: I want to pose a question about these small facilities we've been talking about. Many of us have no responsibility in running an institution, and I'm wondering whether some of us who have would deal with the matter of control in these small facilities. I can understand that in getting away from the mass institutions you're getting away from the bureaucratic way of solving problems. You avoid the conflict between administration and inmate. But it seems to me that in these small facilities you can have the repressions, you can have the same problems that you have in a large institution. How do you supervise so that you have quality homes, quality small facilities?

Can the small community-based facility avoid becoming as destructive as our mass institution?

Konopka: I was struck by this, too, in my own concept of the small facility. The good thing is that it is located in the community, and it avoids outcasting people by taking them away from the rest of the large community. But I think the danger of, let's say a tyrant, taking four children and torturing them has been proven as perfectly possible. But you must remember that the community is involved with this facility, the community has some control, too. The community can look. For instance, I'm working with the Junior League in one of our

institutions right now. The least important thing is that there are nice ladies coming in to play with the youngsters. The important thing is that the community is looking, it's seeing things that are supposedly not to be seen by community eyes. That's the kind of control safeguard I think small facilities should and would have.

Schoen: At the risk of talking about my community, Rochester, I think I can speak of a program there which is really very close to what we are talking about. The program emerged from the community itself about two years ago. A judge spearheaded a drive to organize Rochester's power structure, namely the sheriff, the chief of police, the mayor and various attorneys. They got together and said, "We have a problem and we need an alternative. One exists now, and that is boys being sent to the training school and the reformatory. So they created a community alternative, much like the one we've been talking about. They found a residence in the city, with individual bedrooms and a large living room—it's an old place that was built around 1910. It's staffed by two full time residents and a secretary, who are aided by a group of volunteers from a nearby junior college. The program is designed to serve anyone in the community at any age. Right now, 15 boys are in it, and eventually there will be girls. It's truly voluntary. If a person wants to enter the program, he can enter. If he wants to leave, he can leave, the alternative being whatever the normal process would be. The program duplicates nothing in the community; if the participants are going to go to vocational school or high school or junior college, they go. They use the community's facilities. Everybody does his thing in the community. There are several controls imposed by the group on its members. One of them we just talked about, and that is the group decides when someone is ready to go out into the community. One thing that happens in the program is that people in it move from being dependents to being residents and finally, when the group judges them ready, to being volunteers, helping others in the program. Mind you now, these are all individuals who today would all be in a state institution. These are all internal considerations. Externally, the facility is closely tied to the community. It has a board of directors from the community, but more importantly, it has an advisory group comprised of about 60 members of Rochester's power

structure. It's given many responsibilities, but most notable is its employment committee. If a person in the program needs a job, he presents himself to the committee, which has considerable resources in the community. And unless there is that kind of involvement, a person has one hell of a time finding a job. There is also an admissions committee, which has on it a psychiatrist and a retired banker who is extremely excited about the program and is constantly bending the ears on the boards of directors he is on. The admissions committee looks over an applicant to the program, lets him stay in the home a few days and if he wants to stay, makes a determination. The banker is a prime example of getting the community vitally involved. It works so much better to have him decide who should join the group than to have social workers and corrections people say, "hey, kids, this is what you need." That's the quickest way to turn them off. Let me say in closing that there has not been a single failure at this point. There have been no runaways. And it's obvious why: time isn't spend trying to convince the kid that this is in fact a good treatment process.

Lacey: Here we are talking about a group home that is community based, and located within the community from which most of the people who live there come. I think now we should make some specific suggestions as to the design and organization of such a facility. And I think perhaps one of the problems we have to solve is how to prevent these facilities from becoming institutionalized. How can it not be institutionalized, with people having the stigma that they are bad, that they really are not a part of the community but just something stuck in the middle of it. And we should also determine how it can be used not just as a 24 hour-a-day home for these people, but as a day center for people to come to for help if they need it, or where they can ask to come to stay if they feel that it would be preferable to wherever they lived presently.

Hedin: I think that is one basic factor in our philosophy, that not only should this facility be available to the youngster who has been adjudicated, but also to parents and families who are casting about to find a way to solve their youngsters' problems in home, in school, or in society. It shouldn't be for delinquents only.

Kirkland: As I see it, the youth community program is one which is designed to help the individual to meet the social and psychological needs which impede adequate functioning in his home or his neighborhood environment. The uniqueness of the program is that it continually engages the individual in the community and enables him to reintegrate himself more easily into his own or a similar life atmosphere. To ensure the success of the program, significant citizens must be involved, particularly on the board of directors of advisory boards. Such people as those connected with the media, business or education would be invaluable. These people would function in a number of ways. The communication media, for example, could help to educate the community about the goals, progress, and problems of the program.

Hedin: One thing that I would like to see is the inclusion of youths on the board of directors, from both the community and the center. It might appear to be tokenism, since the board would probably be heavily weighted by adults, but I think this kind of participation is necessary.

Lacey: Participation by the youngster is also necessary in determining whether he should enter the facility. We've said that the residents would be juveniles who either must stay somewhere other than home, or choose to live away from home. Regardless, it should always be a choice on the individual's part, whether in or out of the juvenile court setting. In line with this, we should orient judges more to establishing a rapport with juveniles so that they could together weigh the alternatives from which they have to choose. I think, too, the judge should carefully consider whether the youth would fit into the center. I think it's important that the people living there have something in common in their social lives. If the age limits are extended too far up or down, some problems might result. A person of 30 wouldn't have the same kind of social interests that a person of 13 might have. I think a cut-off age would be 17.

Berdie: The size of the group should also be considered. I think 16 is a good number, and although we haven't talked about it, I think having eight boys and eight girls living coeducationally would be an excellent idea.

Kirkland: Another thing to be considered by whoever it is that decides someone should enter the facility is that the person must be able to tolerate close peer relationships. The residents would be assuming a significant role for their own responsibilities and discipline in conjunction with staff guidance and support. They have to be able to take on this responsibility.

How will the community be involved?

Lacey: There was a great deal of discussion before about stressing the involvement of the youngsters in making decisions. I think we should note that in a situation such as this, majority rule cannot always prevail; a consensus must be reached. If the process of majority rule were to have total control of the decision making process, it's very easy to have someone running the show in this small a group. He could very easily, quietly and behind the scenes, twist or break enough arms to get his rule imposed on the rest of the group. Each person should have a chance to express his opinions without fear of intimidation. If a consensus system of decision making were put into effect, I think the group could be very effective in judging when particular people are ready to return to the community. As we've said, this is not something that can be decided arbitrarily from the top. The length of time a person stays should be determined by group discussion. We've stressed this all along: people can't have things done to them, they have to be involved.

Kirkland: One way we can tie together the different kinds of involvement—community, participant, and the correctional system—is to set up a staff utilizing people from all three. The 24 hour-a-day staffing would be done by the residents themselves, with 16 to 20 residents to share the burden. They would be aided by a director, who would have two full time assistants and perhaps a secretary. And as we mentioned before, volunteers from the community, such as students to help as tutors, would also be involved in the facility.

Lacey: It is certainly important to seek qualified staff in the community. One pitfall, though, is that sometimes people from the community are a little more punitive than people brought in from the outside. That should be watched carefully, especially in hiring directors for the facilities. And whenever possible, the staff should in-

clude former delinquents, especially some of the recently rehabilitated people who are still young and could establish rapport quickly. I don't think their youthfulness should be frowned upon, either. It was pointed out that sometimes we underestimate the potential of younger people to make a contribution, that we are overly protective about having them take positions of responsibility.

Can all offenders be placed in this new facility?

Keve: We've developed a good model of what we would like to see as the best youth treatment facility. However, one thing that has been omitted bothers me a little. Anyone who deals with corrections and hears of these proposals will know that there are certain young people who are so damaged, hostile and dangerous that you're kidding yourself to think you could put them in one of these facilities. I think we agree on this, and I don't want some people to think we are unrealistic because we think we can put all youths into this situation. We know we can't. Some must be kept out of these places because they ruin it for the others in them.

Gingold: I think this is a valid point. However, we must remember that all young people regardless of their suitability for youth communities are being sent to mass institutions. I'm anxious to see those youths, who are runners we can't hold onto, put into one of these small facilities as soon as possible. If the shift from mass institution to youth community were put under local control, I think the shift could be made right away without those youngsters being canned somewhere, waiting for this type of change. We have to eliminate the rationalization that we have to have state warehouses for these running youngsters.

Keve: I would agree. But we should make it clear that it is the availability and the underlying judicious use of such a facility that makes workable the other things we have been talking about.

Konopka: I have to disagree with the idea that a high security facility makes community-based treatment possible. No doubt some secure facility is necessary for those we do not yet know how to handle. Actually, there are many more we do know how to treat but we do not do it. As long as we place so many delinquents into

mass institutions with only a pretense of actual help, we are increasing behavior problems. Our aim, therefore, must be to finally establish the new form of community-based facilities, and then evaluate how many youngsters cannot be worked with in such a setting, mostly because of our own lack of knowledge and skill.

At the end of the one-day institute it was agreed to send to each legislator recommendations that would help them in making decisions regarding delinquency institutions in the State of Minnesota. The text of the recommendations follows.

Recommendations for Community-based Correctional Services for Juvenile Delinquents Including, in particular, Community-based Youth Centers.

On April 13, 1970, the Center for Youth Development and Research at the University of Minnesota convened a small working conference of professional and lay people concerned with juvenile delinquency. *The consensus reached at the conference was that no more mass juvenile delinquency institutions should be built and no further appropriations for them should be made. The conference participants urged, in particular, the establishment of community-based youth centers as a major alternative to the mass institutions.* The conferees recognized, further, that most, but not all youngsters can be served by such community-based youth centers; a range of graded services must be available, also at the local level, to meet the needs for juvenile correctional services.

The essential elements in the total approach to community-based correctional services endorsed at this conference include:

1. The upgrading of all probation services.
2. The availability of a graded series of foster homes and group homes in the community *with major reliance on community-based youth centers.*
3. The availability of intensive treatment facilities in the local community for emotionally disturbed youngsters.
4. The availability of separate, secure facilities for the small number of severely damaged delinquents who cannot make use of more open settings.

THE 1971 MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE IS URGED TO CONSIDER AND MAKE APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY-BASED YOUTH CENTERS ON A DEMONSTRATION BASIS ALONG WITH THE APPROPRIATE RANGE OF SERVICES NECESSARY TO A TOTAL APPROACH TO COMMUNITY-BASED CORRECTIONAL SERVICES FOR JUVENILES.

Background Information

Delinquency is a serious and growing social problem, costly in dollars, in warped lives, and in loss of productive potential. A review of programs, literature, and research indicates that much has been known about causes, prevention, and effective treatment of delinquency in the past five decades, but relatively little of this knowledge has been applied. The factors standing in the way of the effective application of this knowledge have included the following:

1) lack of funds, or the channeling of funds into existing facilities and programs instead of into new facilities and programs which might utilize new knowledge.
2) lack of commitment to a treatment and rehabilitation goal, partly because of long-held emphasis on "punishment of the wicked," and partly because of lack of information or refusal to accept information about how to effect change in delinquency patterns.
3) lack of enough trained staff to implement new programs of prevention and treatment except on a very small scale.

Rehabilitation has a price tag, but if a treatment program is effective in channeling delinquents into constructive and productive careers, the society has a chance to benefit from their services as adult citizens, instead of continuing to pay the cost of housing them in reformatories and prisons through much of their adult lives, and continuing to pay in human suffering for the acts of violence they may commit if untreated. Untreated delinquency is vastly more expensive than the treatment program recommended in this report.

The public will also get more for its correctional dollar because community-based programs are more effective and less costly (note the experience with Youth Correctional Centers in California). Actually, the cost of such an approach to the State of Minnesota will be *decreased* as local communities share a more substantial part of the cost of correctional services. *Conferees agreed that the State should provide matching funds for the development of local facilities and their operation.*

26

The Community-based Youth Center

Under the approach proposed by this conference, small residential centers would be available in the delinquent's community. If possible, the child would continue to attend his own school, or be employed in the community. *Every effort would be made to utilize existing community services for special counseling, physical or emotional therapy, job training, tutoring, and recreation. No available services would be duplicated at the youth center.* In addition, the residents of the center would meet in groups almost daily to discuss each resident's "progress" and what each can do to help one another move toward individualized rehabilitation goals.

In her forthcoming book on delinquency institutions, Gisela Konopka describes this type of youth center as follows:

The model of the delinquency institution as envisioned here is neither a correctional one (prison), nor a training one (traditional 3R's school), nor a clinical one (hospital), nor a habit-forming one (military). The model is a *living-learning intimate youth-oriented* community. It is distinguished from the usual family living by its group living with special emphasis on mutual aid among young people. *Adults are enablers* who know how to enhance group spirit, can give individual attention, and who can offer additional services needed by individuals, like psychological, psychiatric or social help, remedial school work, development of special skills. The *total program* is geared toward *enhancement of self-respect.* The most significant media used are warm adult-youngster relationships and the conscious use of small group interaction in an open and accepting group climate. Other media are the whole world of knowledge, art, music, physical exercise—anything that makes life rich, worth living, enjoyable. *The model youth community is not an isolated island of goodness and beauty, but more a safe base situated within the wider community with opportunities to learn to cope with the frustrations and tensions of reality.* Young people will learn to take risks in reality, and if they fail, their community will offer them the opportunity to return to safety until they can handle themselves without such help.